

### Famine Relief Works in Chitradurga District

\*Q—278. Sri B. L. GOWDA (Challakere).—

Will the Minister for Revenue and Forests be pleased to state :—

(a) the total amount spent under famine relief works in Chitradurga District during the last five years (yearwise and Departmental wise figures may be given);

(b) the steps taken towards permanent relief in the above District?

A.—Sri B. RACHAIAH (Minister for Revenue and Forests).—

(a) Department	1962-63	1963-64
Revenue Department	1,33,371-57	1,60,655-16
Public Works Department	...	...
Total	1,33,371-57	1,60,655-16

  

Department	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67
Revenue Department	2,58,161-40	2,19,960-15	10,07,997-60
Public Works Department	...	26,605-00	1,69,937-00
Total	2,58,161-40	2,46,565-15	11,77,934-60

(b) The following grants under several head of accounts are being given year by year to combat the situation in addition to the works of Public Works Department and Soil Conservation which provide permanent relief to some extent.—

- 1 64 Famine Relief.
- 2 Irrigation Wells.
- 3 Land Improvement Loan.
- 4 Takavi Loan.
- 5 Drinking water wells.

### NOTICES OF BREACH OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point is, while actually the entire question is seized by the Court, whether this statement of the Chief Minister amounts to a breach of privilege of this House.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA (Arkalgud).—Sir, I have carefully examined the question regarding the statement of the Hon'ble Chief Minister and I submit that there is a *prima facie* case to refer the issue to the Privileges Committee. As you are aware, cases have been launched against some members of this House in connection with 'Vidhana Soudha Chalo' affair. The Court is seized of the matter. It should be presumed that everyone is innocent unless and until he is proved to be guilty. In this case the Chief Minister has already passed a verdict that some members of this House are involved in that episode. It may be stated here.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member is not arguing the case ! He should just explain so that I may consider whether it should be one in which I should give consent.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—The statement made by the Chief Minister is a breach of privilege of this House and not of the Court.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Harihar).—The general inference would be from the statement of the Chief Minister that some out of the 216 members have a hand in the 'Vidhana Soudha Chalo' affair, which was a *prima facie* violation or whatever it is.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The matter is pending in a Court !

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—That is exactly what the Chief Minister ought not to have said is the contention of the Hon'ble member.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Nanje Gowda is not arguing the whole case as if the matter is before the Privileges Committee and all that has to be said is in support of his motion. Let the member be brief.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—The Hon'ble Chief Minister has not revealed the names and therefore it does not take away the effect of my Motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Member Sri Nanje Gowda had given notice of a privilege motion with a request that the matter may be referred to a Committee. The motion is that the Chief Minister made a statement wherein he stated that he has got facts that some members are also involved in it. A further point that is urged is that the entire question is seized by the Court and therefore it amounts to a breach of privilege of this House. Two ideas are covered in this motion, one is different from the other. One is that the matter is *sub judice* and therefore the debate on that should not be allowed. But that is not something which could be considered as a breach of privilege. It does not infringe any right of the member. The member felt that there is an encroachment on their rights. Names are not mentioned here; the case in which their cases are pending are not referred to nor the Court in which it is pending. Neither has the discussion taken place. Even if a debate has taken place it could not be a breach of privilege of the House. I am unable to understand that there is any matter which is seized by the Court and therefore there is a bar for its discussion by

this House. If there is no bar there is no breach of privilege. I do not know what exactly the member means by saying that a discussion should not take place when the matter is pending in the Court. In respect of any litigation in the Courts, certain rules and regulations have to be followed here. With regard to this privilege motion there is nothing to substantiate it. I am unable to think that there is any breach of privilege and rights and privileges of the members of the House are not infringed. Therefore there is no substance in the motion tabled by the member.

**SRI H. N. NANJE GOWDA.**—The P.W.D. Minister has while answering question No. 15 on 27th June 1967, stated that the Harangi Reservoir Project to be constructed at Hudugur would store 15.80 T.M. Cft. of water and that this is more than the water to be stored at Haradur site. It is a deliberate incorrect statement made by the Minister to mislead the House. My contention is that the old site selected by the previous Ministry when Sri H. M. Channabasappa was the P.W.D. Minister is better and would store more water and for political reasons the site is changed.

To substantiate his statement the Minister said that Harangi Reservoir at Hudugur would store 15.80 T.M C. Ft. of water and this storags would be more than the original Haradur site. It is a deliberate untrue statement. The actual truth is the storage capacity at Hudgur is 7 T.M.C.Ft. and at Haradur 12 T.M.C.Ft.

According to his own statement, he has stated that it is possible to command 75,000 acres of achkat at the present dam site. According to his own statement, by the original site, it can command 1,05,000 acres achkat. I cannot understand how it is more beneficial. I would request you, Sir, to compel the Minister to produce the concerned records and file before this House. Before that, I may cite a decision from May's Parliamentary Practice wherein in page 115, the House may treat the making of a deliberately misleading statement as contempt. Here the Hon'ble Minister has made a misleading statement and he has attempted to make us believe what he is telling is true and to make us believe that Hudugur site is better than Haradur.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—What are the facts of the case in which it is stated that it amounts to contempt?

**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.**—That is famous Profuma case.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Now, the Member Sri Nanje Gowda has taken great pains to state the matter and has supported the motion or the suggestion which is contained in his letter wherein he says that there is a breach of privilege.

**SRI VEERENDRA PATIL** (Minister for Public Works).—May I say something? Sir, just now, the Hon'ble Member made an allegation that on 27-6 1967 while replying to the supplementaries I made a false statement in this House deliberately to mislead this House. Sir, let me assure the Hon'ble House that I am the last person to indulge in those

(SRI VEERENDRA PATIL)

activities and I believe that I do not allow myself to stoop down to that level. It is no doubt true that I have quoted the figures of 15 TMC ft and also 15.80 TMC ft. But that is not with regard to storage. That is only with reference to utilisation. I have got the supplementary note that is before me. The quantity to be utilised according to first proposal is 15 TMC ft. and according to the present proposal it is 15.80 TMC ft. So, the figures that have been quoted by me are only with reference to the question of utilisation and not with reference to storage.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have looked into the book which was cited by the Hon'ble Member and it refers to the matter of 1963 where the Hon'ble Member who was perhaps holding the position of a Minister made a personal statement which contained words which he later on admitted not to be true. Therefore he had been guilty of a grave contempt. I would rather desire that the Member should look into the report and also the resolution because to the best of my recollection that particular Member in the House of Commons made a statement denying the suggestion or allegation made against him on a point of fact and later he appeared before the House and said that he made an incorrect or untrue statement. The House took up the matter for discussion and arrived at the conclusion that the Member had been guilty of a grave contempt.

In the matter now before the House as can be seen from the debate that has taken place in the recent past, there are divergent views on the relative merits of the two schemes. The schemes are yet in a stage of estimates and estimates are always estimates and nothing more. That does not mean that so far as facts are concerned, it has not yet become accomplished which comes in after the implementation of the scheme. But anyway in the circumstances, it is possible to have divergent opinions. When facts or matters in issue are debated like that, it only leads to the conclusion that there is no consensus of opinion or agreement with regard to facts. It is an important circumstance that when a matter has to be referred to the committee of privileges, there should not be any divergent opinion with regard to facts. The procedure employed by the Members who are desirous of making any statement as amounting to contempt is even seen from the various text-books and precedents that they suggest particular words to be taken down; and after that, person who said the words is requested to repeat; and then it is recorded. That is for the purpose of precisely having the facts on which the matter could or could not go before the committee of privileges.

Then it is also seen that the facts have been explained by the Hon'ble Minister for P.W.D. it is seen that there is scope for difference of opinion. Apart from all these aspects, if we are to refer to any fact which is contradicted by another member, to the privileges committee, and if we are also to take into consideration the warmth of the language

that is employed and if we are to infer that there is anything like disrespect or contempt of either individual member or of the House, then the debates that are taking place would in bulk, have to go before the privileges committee. But anyway for several reasons I am inclined to think that there is no *prima facie* case and I cannot give consent for its being brought before the House in this respect.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಪ್ರಿವಿರಡ್ ಮೋಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಇದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದೆ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ !

(Interruption)

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಡಳಿತದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಳಗುತ್ತೀರೋ ? ಪ್ರಿವಿರಡ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕೇ ಬೇಡವೇ ಎಂಬ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅದರ ಒದರಲ್ಲ ಸಂಚಿಮ್ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಮನಗಂಡ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾನು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಅದೂ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ನನ್ನ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏಕತಮಾಗಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವೆಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಅದು ಗಾಢವಾದ ಇಲ್ಲದ ಪ್ರಿವಿರಡ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು ಇವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ನನಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟೆಡ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಿವಿರಡ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿನ ಕಾರ್ಯಕರಾಚಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸೋಣ.

### CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE, re : ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF FOOD GRAINS IN VIEW OF CLOSURE OF SUEZ CANAL

Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY (Malur).—I beg to call the attention of the Minister for Food & Civil Supplies regarding alternative arrangements made by the State Government for the adequate supply of food grains to the people in the State due to closure of Suez Canal.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Food and Civil Supplies).—Sir, Even in a year of normal seasonal conditions, Mysore State is marginally deficit in foodgrains, principally in rice. To the maximum extent possible, our food-gap is bridged by allotments of foodgrains by the Central Government.

Out of the foodgrains imported by the Central Government from abroad, they allot wheat and milo to our State. Our requirement of rice is met by Central Allotments from the surplus States, mainly Andhra Pradesh.

As the Hon'ble Members are aware, Mysore State suffered from acute scarcity conditions last year. In appreciation of this, the Central Government made available to the State sizeable quantities of foodgrains, which enabled us to cope with the situation. This year, even though our State continues to be deficit in foodgrains, the harvest has been better compared to last year. In view of this factor, as also the increased drawals by drought affected States like Bihar and Uttar Pradesh, the releases of foodgrains to our State this year were substantially reduced.